In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

'VĀRAṆĀSI' DHARMASŪRI - DATE AND NATIVITY

VEMPATTI KUTUMBA SASTRI

Synopsis

Dharmasūri (DS), author of *Sāhityaratnākara* (SR) belonged to a Telugu Brahmin family called 'Vāraṇāsi', and hailed from Āndhra Deśa. His exact native place and date are discussed in this paper based on new evidences.

Two different opinions are expressed by Vemuri Narasimha Sastri (VNS) and E. V V. Raghavacharya (EVVR) regarding the native place of DS. While, VNS is of the opinion that DS belonged to a village called Pedapulivarru near Repalle in Guntur Dt., EVVR opines that Kaṭhevaram near Tenali in Guntur Dt. as the native place.

Against these opinions, the article shows that DS might have belonged to a village 'Vāraṇāsi' (now called Kāśinagar by the P & T Dept.) in Ganjam Dt. (in the southern border of Orissa) or any nearby place and that DS should have stayed there for a considerable time because - (i) the Prologue of his *Narakāsuravijayavyāyoga* says that the play was staged for the first time at Puri in Orissa; (ii) Many *ālaṃkārikas* of Orissa like Kaviratna Puruṣottama Miśra (1690-1750), Raghunātha Dāsa (1690-1750), Jagannātha Miśra (1715-1721), Lokanātha Tripāṭhi (1760) and Kaviratna Gopīnātha Pātra have borrowed many expressions and ideas of DS in addition to citing his *ślokas, verbatim*; (iii) Out of the five commentaries on *SR* of DS, three — *Alaṅkārasudhākara, Vivaraṇa* and *Naukā* are written by scholars from Orissa and the others by those from Andhra; and (iv) Dharma Bhaṭṭa, author of *Bhāṣyaratnaprabhā* and *Brahmāmṛta-varṣiṇī* (often identified with DS) is different from DS and that it might have been Dharma Bhaṭṭa who lived in Pedapulivarru.

Regarding the date of DS, EVVR fixes his period to be 1414-1625 as based on the citations from *SR* by Appakavi and Gaurana. The writers of History of Sanskrit Poetics have suggested various dates between 1425-1550.

The article shows that the *SR* cited by Appakavi and Gaurana is not by DS and that King Dharma Bhūpa mentioned by DS is the King Padmanābha Anaṅga Bhīma Deva of Bala Khimuṇḍi dynasty (1640-1685).

Also, Gurjāla Raṅgaśāyin (late 17th Century) is the earliest writer to quote *SR* in his commentary *Īmoda* (ascertained to have been written between 1660-1670) on *Rasamañjarī*.

From all these, the article concludes that DS should have been born in the early 17th century and *SR* was written between 1650-1660.

AGHORAŚIVA'S BACKGROUND

RICHARD H. DAVIS

The twelfth-century *ācārya* Aghoraśiva, to whose study Dr. S. S. Janaki has made considerable scholarly contributions over the past ten years, was certainly one of the most important of all Śaiva Siddhānta authors who wrote in Sanskrit. His vast *Kriyākramadyotikā*, the *paddhati* he completed in 1156 A. D., has been probably the most authoritative prescriptive guide to ritual practice in the Śaiva community of Tamilnadu over the 800 and more years since it was composed. The philosophical commentaries he wrote on such works as Bhojadeva's *Tattvaprakāśa*, Rāmakaṇṭha's *Nādakārikā*, Śrīkaṇṭha's *Ratnatraya*, and the three works of Sadyojyoti, *Tattvasaṃgraha, Tattvatrayanirṇaya*, and *Bhogakārikā*, give the fullest philosophical statement of the Śaiva Siddhānta viewpoint prior to the time of the four *santāna-gurus*, and may have provided an important source of the Tamil compositions of Meykaṇṭār and his followers in the following century.[1]

In his works, Aghoraśiva portrays himself as an ardent champion of the dualist views of Śaiva Siddhānta. For instance, he explains his reasons for composing his commentary on the *Tattvaprakāśa* in this way:

> I undertake this commentary because this text has elsewhere been commented upon by others who are filled with the tainted ideas of non-dualism (Advaita) and who lack the true knowledge of Siddhānta.[2]

---

1. Wayne Surdam's dissertation provid the most useful summary of what is so far known of Aghoraśiva, and I have relied on it in a number of places in this essay. See Wayne Surdam, "South Indian Śaiva Rites of Initiation," (unpub. Ph. D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1984), pp. xvi-xxi. For a list of Aghoraśiva's known works, see V. Raghavan, *New Catalogus Catalogorum*, Vol. I. (University of Madras, 1968), pp. 58-9. Studies on the relationship between the works of Aghoraśiva and the Śaiva Siddhānta authors of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries writing in Tamil are yet to be undertaken. Hélène Brunner sets out a few philosophical distinctions in "Importance de la littérature āgamique pour l'étude des religions vivants de l'Inde," *Indologica Taurinensia* 3-4 (1975-76), pp. 107-24.

2. *Tattvaprakaśavṛtti*, v. 1

अद्वैतवासनाविष्टैः सिद्धान्तज्ञानवर्जितैः ।
व्याख्यातोऽन्यान्यथाऽन्यैर्यत् स ततोऽस्माकमुद्यमः ॥

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

As Wayne Surdam points out, Aghoraśiva seldom refers to literature other than Āgamas and related works in his commentaries.

> In his commentaries Aghoraśivācārya supports his interpretations almost exclusively from the āgamic literature and rarely, if ever, cites passages from upaniṣadic, purāṇic, or classical philosophical material. He seems to have envisioned his position as that of an āgamic Śaiva purist who had the responsibility to correct the misinterpretations of the āgamic material by *advaitins, vaidikas*, and other non-*Siddhāntins*.[3]

Purist that he was, Aghoraśiva appears to have been a highly influential preceptor during his own lifetime, for he refers to himself as an "instructor of two lakhs of pupils" *(lakṣadvayādhyāpaka)* at the conclusion of his *Tattvaprakāśavṛtti*.[4]

In this essay, I want to look more closely at the intellectual background of Aghoraśiva, in the light of the persistent view that Śaiva Siddhānta is solely a Tamilian school of Hindu philosophy.

I

The importance of Śaiva Siddhānta theology in Tamilnadu over the past centuries and its absence from other parts of South Asia have led many historians of religions to characterise Śaiva Siddhānta as exclusively Tamil in origin. This notion goes back at least to one of the pioneers of Tamil studies, the missionary G. U. Pope, who wrote in his study and translation of Māṇikkavācakar's *Tiruvācakam* :

> The Śaiva siddhānta is the most elaborate, influential and undoubtedly the most valuable of all the religions of India. It is peculiarly the Southern Indian and Tamil religion and must be studied by every one who hopes to understand and influence the great South Indian peoples.[5]

The same assumption reappears, with a slight disclaimer, in M. Dhavamony's recent summary account of "Śaiva siddhānta" in the *Encyclopedia of religion*.

3. Surdam, "South Indian Śaiva Rites," p. xx.

4. *Tattvaprakāśavṛtti*, after v. 76:

... इति लक्षद्वयाध्यापक - श्रीमदघोरशिवाचार्यविरचिता तत्त्वप्रकाशिकावृत्तिः समाप्ता ।

5. G. U. Pope (tr) *The Tiruvācagam or 'Sacred Utterances' of the Tamil Poet, Saint, and Sage Māṇikka-vācagar* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1900), p lxxiv.

> Śaiva siddhānta is an important medieval system of Śaiva thought. The term technically refers to a set of Śaiva theologies written in Sanskrit and Tamil in South India, although this classification need not be considered a rigid one.[6]

I wish to question this identification of Śaiva Siddhānta with a particular region and predominantly with one regional language, and I think Aghoraśiva offers the following useful perspective for doing so.

It is certain that Aghoraśiva lived in Tamilnadu, for he refers to himself in one of his works as "a *guru* who ornaments the Colas"[7]. He was a Śaivabrāhmaṇa of the Kauṇḍiṇya clan, initiated into the priesthood by one Dhyānaśiva of Kāñcīpuram. A legend links Aghoraśiva with Cidambaram. According to this account, the legendary sage Durvāsas appeared before Aghoraśiva in Cidambaram and performed his consecration (*ācāryābhiṣeka*) there. Aghoraśiva opens his *Tattvasaṃgrahaṭīkā* with homage to Śiva as "Lord of Space, Lord of the Assembly" (*abhrasabhāpati*), common titles for Śiva Naṭarāja as manifest at Cidambaram.[8] An "Aghoraśivācārya Maṭha" at the western border of Cidambaram was supposedly founded by the master himself and now is presided over by one of his descendents.[9] Thus it appears likely that Aghoraśiva associated himself with this most significant South Indian Śaiva site.

At first glance, then, what we know of Aghoraśiva seems to reaffirm the connection of Śaiva Siddhānta with Tamilnadu. Here, after all, we find an eminent Śaiva Siddhānta author of the twelfth century who, although he did not write in the Tamil language, did live and teach in Tamilnadu, and continues to exert his influence on ritual practitioners almost exclusively in Tamilnadu. When we begin to look more closely into his background, however, we discover that his intellectual outlook is not at all limited to this region.

6. M. Dhavamony, "Śaivism: Śaiva siddhānta" in Mircea Eliade (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Religion* (New York, 1987), Vol. 13, p. 11.

7. *Tattvatrayanirṇayavṛtti*, v. 32.

8. Introduction. v. 1.

9 The Cidambaram legend is found in the Tamil introduction to *Kriyākramadyotika* (Cidambaram, 1927), pp. 11-2, and reported by Surdam, "South Indian Śaiva Rites," p. xviii. On the Aghoraśivācārya Maṭha, see J. M. Somasundaram, *The University's Environs* (Annamalai University, 1957), p. 158.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

At the conclusion of his *Mahotsavavidhi*, the final portion of the *Kriyākramadyotikā*, Aghoraśiva locates himself in a lineage of twelve Śaiva Siddhānta teachers reaching back to the sage Durvāsas. Among his predecessors, we see Uttuṅgaśiva, a Gujarati living at Kalyāṇanagarī, and also Brahmaśiva from Gujarat; two teachers who served as royal preceptors in Vārāṇasī, Pūrṇaśiva and Vidyāntaśiva; Sarvātmaśivika who was "received hospitably and remained in great Purī," in the Northern Konkan region near the present site of Bombay; and Śrīkaṇṭhaśiva who was a "bull among the Bengalis." Aghoraśiva's own preceptor Dhyānaśiva also hailed from the Bengal region, apparently before coming south to Tamilnadu. There are several others in the list who did live in the Cola country, but the overriding indication is that Aghoraśiva placed himself within a pan-Indian network of Śaiva Siddhānta preceptors.[10]

As a commentator as well, Aghoraśiva shows considerable geographical breadth. Most famous of his commentaries is his *vṛtti* on the *Tattvaprakāśa*. This work is ascribed to Bhojadeva, most likely the famous Paramāra king of the eleventh century, who ruled in the Dhāra region (Malwa, in Madhya Pradesh state). According to Aghoraśiva, this Bhojadeva had for his *guru*, Uttuṅgaśiva's younger brother.[11] In addition, Aghoraśiva commented on works by Sadyojyoti, Śrīkaṇṭha, Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha, and Rāmakaṇṭha II. All of these Śaiva Siddhānta authors, with the possible exception of Sadyojyoti, lived and taught in Kashmir, at the opposite end of the subcontinent from Tamilnadu.

When historians of religion speak of "Kashmiri Śaivism," they generally refer to the monist philosophical schools that grew up in the

10. *Mahotsavavidhi* (South Indian Archaka Association, Madras, 1974), pp. 424-27.

11. Pierre-Sylvain Filliozat disputes this identification, arguing that another King Bhoja—the Pratihāra Mihira Bhoja ruling in Kānyakubja in the ninth century—may have been the author of this work. See Filliozat, "Le Tattvaprakāśa du Roi Bhoja et les commentairies d'Aghoraśivācārya et de Śrīkumāra," *Journal Asiatique* 259 (1971), 247-48. Another Siddhānta work attributed to Bhojadeva is the *Siddhāntasārapaddhati*, a ritual digest transcribed in 1067 (i.e., shortly after the reign of Bhoja of Dhārā, who ruled from 1005 to about 1054). See Hraprasad Shastri, *A Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Government Collection under the care of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* (Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta, 1925), Vol. 3, p. 52. On Uttuṅgaśiva and Bhojadeva, see K. C. Pandey, *An Outline of History of Śaiva Philosophy* (Delhi, 1986), pp. 23-4; and *Mahotsavavidhi*, p. 425.

north-west parts of the subcontinent, such as the Pratyabhijñā, Spanda, and Trika schools, and to the renowned authors Abhinavagupta and Kṣemarāja of the tenth and eleventh centuries, who gave Āgama-based Śaiva non-dualism its fullest theological articulation. But there were other Śaiva schools in Kashmir at the time, including the Śaiva Siddhānta. In fact, as Alexis Sanderson points out, during Abhinavagupta's and Kṣemarāja's time, "it was the Śaiva Siddhānta that was the dominant Śaiva doctrine *(jñāna)* in Kashmir," not the groups that later came to be called "Kashmiri Śaivism."[12]

It is not known just when Śaiva Siddhānta became prevalent in Kashmir, but the most important author in laying the philosophical foundation for Kashmiri Śaiva Siddhānta was undoubtedly Sadyojyoti, who may or may not have resided there. It is tempting to imagine one of Sadyojyoti's forebears—perhaps his *guru* Ugrajyoti—being brought to Kashmir from the Gangetic plain, much as the eighth century Kashmiri imperial ruler Lalitāditya brought the esteemed scholar Atrigupta, Abhinavagupta's ancestor, from Kānyakubja to Kashmir after his military foray into the Doab. But I know of no definite evidence for this. What is certain is that, by the beginning of the tenth century, the Śaiva dualist views of Sadyojyoti (as well as those of other Siddhānta authors Bṛhaspati and Śaṅkara Nandana, whose works are no longer available) were well-known in Kashmir, and that monist authors like Somānanda (in his *Śivadṛṣṭi*) and Abhinavagupta spent considerable effort in attempting to refute their positions.[13]

The dualistic Śaiva theology sketched out in the works of Sadyojyoti was further developed and elaborated by the "Kaṇṭha" - lineage of Kashmiri Siddhāntins. The lineage includes Rāmakaṇṭha I, Vidyākaṇṭha, Śrīkaṇṭha, Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha, and Rāmakaṇṭha II.[14] (The *Śaivabhūṣaṇa* mentions two more Kaṇṭhas in its list of eighteen *paddhati* authors, Vibhūtikaṇṭha and Nīlakaṇṭha, but nothing more than names are known

12. Alexis Sanderson, "Śaivism: Śaivism in Kashmir," in M. Eliade (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Religion*, Vol. 13, p. 16. For a fuller description of Kashmiri Śaiva schools (though weak on dualist orders), see also Mark S. G. Dyczkowski, *The Doctrine of Vibration* (Albany, 1987), pp. 1-31.

13. N. R. Bhatt lists Sadyojyoti's known works in *Mataṅgapārameśvarāgama* (*Vidyāpāda*), (Pondichery, 1977), pp. xi-xii.

14. For a full description of this lineage, see Pandey, *Outline*, pp. 15-25; and N. R. Bhatt, pp. viii-xiv.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

of them.[15]) Of these authors, Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha lived most likely in the tenth century, since he quotes the ninth century author Utpaladeva and is in turn quoted by the eleventh century writer Kṣemarāja.[16] The most prolific of the Kaṇṭha lineage was Rāmakaṇṭha II, the son and disciple of Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha, living probably in the early eleventh century. Rāmakaṇṭha II made clear his intellectual debt to Sadyojyoti, not only by commenting on three or four of the master's works, but also in this explicit acknowledgement.

> Of all teachers, I especially praise Sadyojyoti and Bṛhaspati, who have illuminated the Siddhānta path to perfection (*siddhabhāvata*).[17]

After the literary efflorescence of Rāmakaṇṭha II, we hear no more of Kaṇṭha authors writing in Kashmir. It is not at all clear what caused the sudden obscuration of Śaiva Siddhānta in Kashmir at this moment. But it appears that the lamp of Śaiva *jñāna* as the Kaṇṭhas had illuminated it was transmitted down to South India primarily through the mediation of Aghoraśiva. While there is no evidence to support the supposition that Aghoraśiva travelled to the north to study with Rāmakaṇṭha II, he certainly did declare his respect for the Kashmiri teacher (while punning on his name).

> Following faithfully the footsteps of that strong-voiced (*mahā-kaṇṭha*) lion (*kaṇṭhīrava*) Rāmakaṇṭha, I do not fear the trumpetings of those rutting elephants, the sophists (*kutārkika*).[18]

Accordingly he occupied himself particularly with explicating the works of Sadyojyoti and those of the Kashmiri Kaṇṭha Siddhāntins.

15. Hélène Brunner-Lachaux (tr.), *Somaśambhupaddhati* (*Premiere Partie*), Pondichery, 1963, p. xxii.

16. N. R. Bhatt, p. xii ; Hélène Brunner- Lachaux (tr.), *Mṛgendrāgama: Section des rites et section du comportement* (Pondichery, 1985), p. xxii.

17. *Mātaṅgapārameśvarāgamavṛtti*, *vidyāpāda*, ch. 1, introductory v. 2 :
यास्यां प्रकाशितं वर्त्म सिद्धान्ते सिद्धभावतः ।
गुरूणामपि तौ वन्द्यौ सद्योज्योतिर्बृहस्पती ॥
Bṛhaspati wrote the now-lost *Śivatanuśāstra*, a work which Abhinavagupta, Aghoraśiva and Rāmakaṇṭha II quoted. See Pandey, *Outline*, pp. 16-7.

18. *Mṛgendrāgamavṛttidipikā*, *vidyāpāda*, v. 4 :
रामकण्ठमहाकण्ठ-कण्ठीरव-ननुगः ।
न कुतार्किकमातङ्गघण्टिनेभ्यो बिभेम्यहम् ॥

II

In the Cidambaram legend, as I have mentioned, Aghoraśiva receives his priestly consecration from Durvāsas himself. In the *Mahotsavavidhi*, Aghoraśiva cites Durvāsas as the founder of his *vaṃśa*, and goes on to salute him : "I worship the sage Durvāsas, the great teacher of the *śivajñāna*, from whom arose the lineage of *gurus* in that good abode of Āmarda."[19] The fundamental role of Durvāsas as progenitor of Śaiva teachings among humans is recognized by other Śaiva authors as well, even those not of the Śaiva Siddhānta persuasion. For instance, Abhinavagupta tells us that Durvāsas was responsible for the division of Śaivism into three ontological tendencies :

> (Śiva) instructed the sage, Durvāsas, to revive the Śaivāgamic teaching. The sage accordingly divided all the Śaivāgamas into three classes accordingly as they taught monism, dualism or monism-cum-dualism, imparted their knowledge to his three mind-born sons, Tryambaka, Āmardaka, and Śrīnātha respectively, and charged each one of them separately with the mission of spreading the knowledge of the respective Āgamas. Thus there came into existence three Śaiva Tantric Schools, each known by the name of the first earthly progenitor.[20]

Here again the name Āmardaka serves as a link between Durvāsas and the dualistic tradition in Śaivism.

Aghoraśiva was apparently affiliated with the monastic network or lineage known as Āmarda or Āmardaka. In the *Prāyaścittasamuccaya*, Trilocanaśiva traces his own lineage starting with Durvāsas who, he says, established the *guruvaṃśa* at Āmardaka, through a number of preceptors including Uttuṅgaśiva, Someśāna, Sarvātmaśiva, and finally Aghoraśiva.[21] Elsewhere Trilocanaśiva identifies himself with the "Āmarda-āśrama," and his commentator Anantaśambhu restates this.[22] So Trilocanaśiva's affiliation with Āmardaka implicates Aghoraśiva as well. But what exactly is Āmardaka?

19. *Mahotsavavidhi*, p. 424.

20. K. C Pandey, *Abhinavagupta : An Historical and Philosophical Study* (Benares, 1935), Vol. I, p. 72. His summary is based on Abhinavagupta's *Tantraloka*, XXXVI

21. E. Hultzsch, *Report on Sanskrit Manuscripts in Southern India* (Madras, 1896), Vol. II, p. 80.

22. *Siddhāntasārāvali*, *kriya* 90 and *carya* 40.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Aghoraśiva himself lists Āmarda as one of the fifteen Śaiva *maṭhas*, along with those at Kailāsa, Badarī, Devadāru forest, Mattamayūra, Golaka, and others.[23] This tells us only that we are dealing with a monastic complex of some sort, but nothing of its location or character. Fortunately, a number of inscriptions of the tenth through thirteenth centuries also refer to Āmardaka, Mattamayūra, and Golaka, and thereby enable us to begin to reconstruct something, albeit in a fragmentary manner, of the nature of these early medieval Śaiva *maṭhas*.

One of the earliest and most helpful inscriptions was found in the out-of-the-way village of Ranod (ancient Raṇipadra), along the upper course of the Mahuwar River (ancient Madhumatī) in the Guṇa District of Madhya Pradesh, and dates from the tenth century.[24] According to this account, Śiva once performed a sacrifice to Brahman in the Devadāru forest. As the fruit of this act, a lineage (*vaṃśa*) of sages arose, "free from knots, and with many far-extending branches." The inscription traces a series of the sages leading up to a pontiff entitled "the lord of the Āmarddhaka *tīrtha*" and his pupil, the *guru* Purandara. A local ruler named Avantivarman, ensconced in his town of Mattamayūra (present-day Kadwaha), heard of the eminent Śaiva preceptor Purandara, and wishing to be initiated into Śaivism, made a trip to the sage's abode. He propitiated Purandara appropriately, and persuaded him to return with him to the capital.

> There the king immediately requested and underwent Śaiva initiation, and made a suitable presentation to his preceptor. Having given the essence of his kingdom to Purandara, the king became successful (*siṭphalya*) during his lifetime, and Purandara used a portion of his wealth to have a monastery built for sages, equal to Meru, a fit vessel for the jewels who are true sages, in the royal town known as Mattamayūra.

Purandara also had another monastery constructed at Ranod, where this inscription was found. So began the Mattamayūra ("intoxicated peacock") line of Śaiva Siddhānta teachers in central India.

23. *Mahotsavavidhi*, pp. 422-23.

24. F. Kielhorn, "A Stone Inscription from Ranod (Narod)," *Epigraphia Indica* I (1892), 351-61.

This inscription suggests that Āmardaka, like Mattamayūra, referred initially to a specific site, a *tīrtha*, though the original location of Āmardaka has not yet been convincingly identified. More significant, however, is the subsequent spread of its authority. Over the succeeding centuries, Śaiva *gurus* and ascetics identifying themselves with Āmardaka and Mattamayūra turn up in positions of influence in various regions of South Asia. The Mattamayūra Lambakarṇa, for instance, emigrated to Ujjain, where he initiated Sīyaka II, the first independent Paramāra sovereign and the predecessor of Bhojadeva. Further south in Kharepatan, the Mattamayūra *guru* Ātreyi acted as royal preceptor to Raṭṭarāja, the Śilāhāra king of Southern Konkan. Gaganaśiva travelled east into Orissa, where he had a temple built at Ranipur. Members of the Āmardaka lineage appear during the same period in Haddala (Gujarat), Karhad (Maharashtra), and Rajor (Rajasthan).[25]

In Ḍāhala, a colony of Mattamayūras, known by the name Mādhumateyas (i. e., from the Madhumatī area), established a powerful presence in the region for some two hundred years as monastic leaders, temple builders, and royal preceptors under the Kalacuri kings of Tripuri (near present Jabalpur). Yuvarājadeva I (915-945) was the first king among the Ḍāhala Kalacuris to assume the titles of an independent sovereign, and as part of his assertion of royal autonomy he brought to his kingdom the renowned monk Prabhāvaśiva from the Madhumatī region as his initiatory *guru*. This established a pattern by which the fortunes of Kalacuri rulers and Śaiva Siddhānta preceptors were closely intertwined for two centuries. As late as 1174, the Mādhumateya *guru* Vimalaśiva was preceptor to the Kalacuri king Jayasiṃha, and when the Candella king Trailokyamalla conclusively defeated the Kalacuris and annexed their territories, he annexed as well the royal preceptor Śāntaśiva, son and successor of Vimalaśiva.

25. Though there are a number of accounts of these Śaiva lineages available, the most complete and reliable are still probably the two earliest major treatments, those of R. D. Banerji, and V. V. Mirashi. See R. D. Banerji, *The Haihayas of Tripuri and their Monuments*, Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India, No. 23 (Calcutta, 1931), and V. V. Mirashi, "The Śaiva Ācāryas of the Mattamayūra Clan", *Indian Historical Quarterly* 26 (1950), 1-16. Mirashi's introduction to *Corpus Inscriprionum Indicarum*, Vol. 4, containing the inscriptions of the Kalacuris of Tripuri, is also valuable. For an interesting recent treatment, see J Van Troy, "The Social Structure of the Śaiva-siddhāntika Ascetics (700-1300 A.D.)," *Indica* 11 (1974), 77-86. For an attempt at a brief synthetic account of the early medieval Śaiva Siddhānta lineages, with inscriptional references, see Richard Davis, "Ritual in an Oscillating Universe" (unpub. Ph. D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1986), pp. 19-25.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Another of Vimalaśiva's pupils, Dharmaśiva, was responsible for still another Śaiva Siddhānta pilgrimage, this time southward to Andhra Pradesh. The Kākatīya ruler Gaṇapatideva became the first autonomous sovereign of his dynasty and looked to the north for a religious preceptor of a new persuasion. (Prior to his reign, primary religious patronage in the area was given to the Kālāmukha order.) From Ḍāhala he brought Dharmaśiva, his pupil Viśveśvaraśiva (who hailed originally from Bengal), and others from the Mādhumateya line or—as they identified themselves in the south—the Golaki branch of Śaiva Siddhānta.[26] Viśveśvaraśiva performed initiation for the Kākatīya monarch, and for about sixty years the Golaki Śaivas enjoyed extensive support and influence in the region, then almost as abruptly faded from favour in Andhra by the beginning of the fourteenth century. The Vīraśaiva Ārādhya order appears to have supplanted them at this point.

It is possible, then, to reconstruct from epigraphical sources at least a partial picture of Śaiva Siddhānta as it was transmitted and spread throughout South Asia in early medieval times. We learn from inscriptions of several interrelated lineages of *gurus* and ascetics, associating themselves with Āmardaka, Mattamayūra, and Golaki. These *maṭhas*, as Aghoraśiva calls them, should be seen as emanating centres and portable affiliations for Śaiva monks, not as restricted locations, for Āmardakas and Mattamayūras seem to spring up in many parts of India. It is only with the establishment of Islamic hegemony in North India during the thirteenth century that the Śaiva Siddhānta order appears to have become restricted to South India and especially Tamilnadu.

26. The crucial inscription for this branch of Śaiva Siddhānta monastics is from Malkāpuram. J. Ramayya Pantulu, "Malkāpuram Stone-Pillar Inscription of Rudradeva (Rudrāmbā)", *Journal of the Andhra Historical Research Society* 4 (1930), 147-62; a better edition is by D. C. Sircar, in his *Select Inscriptions Bearing on Indian History and Civilization* (Delhi, 1983), Vol. II, pp. 574-91. On the Golakis in South India, see B. G. L. Swamy, "The Golaki School of Saivism in the Tamil Country," *Journal of Indian History* 53 (1975), 167-209; and Cynthia Talbot, "Golaki Maṭha Inscriptions from Andhra Pradesh: A Study of a Śaiva Monastic Lineage," in *Vajapeya: Essays on Evolution of Indian Art and Culture* (Delhi, 1987), pp. 133-46. Bruno Dagens has recently questioned the identification of this lineage as Śaiva Siddhānta. See his *Entre Alampur et Srisailam* (Pondichery, 1984), Vol. I, pp. 76-9.

Unfortunately, for the most part the teachers of the Āmardaka, Mattamayūra, Mādhumateya, and Golaki lineages mentioned in inscriptions cannot be identified as authors of extant Śaiva texts. But it is striking that many Siddhānta authors, not just Trilocanaśiva and Aghoraśiva, explicitly align themselves with these same monastic lineages. Thus Hṛdayaśiva, author of the *Prāyaścittasamuccaya*, identifies himself as the pupil of Īśvaraśiva of the school of Raṇipatra Lambakarṇa of the Mattamayūra line.[27] (It may be recalled that Lambakarṇa is the monk who migrated from Raṇipatra to Ujjain to initiate the Paramāra king Sīyaka II.) Brahmaśambhu, who wrote the *Naimittikakriyānusandhāna* in 938 A.D., belonged to the Karkaroni branch of the Mattamayūra lineage.[28] Iśānaśiva, whose extensive *paddhati* became authoritative in the Kerala region, claims to have lived in the Āmarda monastery, and Somaśambhu of *Somaśambhupaddhati* fame (which was Aghoraśiva's most direct model for his *Kriyākramadyotikā*) states himself as head of the Golaki monastery.[29] Such examples could be multiplied. They attest to a simple but crucial point: that the peripatetic monastics documented in medieval inscriptions and the authors of Sanskrit Śaiva Siddhānta *paddhati* texts saw themselves as members of a single pan-Indian Śaiva order composed of several interrelated lineages or monastic orders.

III

As a Śaiva Siddhāntin, Aghoraśiva was part of a school or order of Śaiva teachers who, basing themselves on the twenty-eight *śaivāgamas*, sought to articulate and spread the dualistic philosophy and the ritual procedures of Śaiva Siddhānta. This was a shared, cumulative endeavour,

27. Hara Prasad Sastri, *A Catalogue of palm-leaf and selected paper mss. belonging to the Durbar Library, Nepal* (Calcutta, 1905), p. 215.

28. H. P. Sastri, *A Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit mss. in the Govt. Collection under the care of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, Vol. III, pp. 1015-16.

29. Hultzsch, *Report of Sanskrit Manuscripts*, Vol. II, p. 110, and *Somaśambhupaddhati* (Devakottai, 1931), p. 297. Aghoraśiva acknowledges his reliance on Somaśambhu (as well as Bhojadeva) at the conclusion of the *dīkṣāvidhi* portion of *Kriyākramadyotikā*.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

involving not only the transmission of the texts but also their gradual and progressive elucidation. Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha expressed this sense of tradition admirably in the introduction to his *Mṛgendrāgamavṛtti* :

> May those of greater understanding forgive whatever I have not said, whatever I have said poorly, and whatever is not illuminated clearly despite my explanation. Let them, like the sun, endeavour solely to erase this commentary's flaws and to clarify it. By all means, may treatises proceed one after another from this one, as a row of lamps is illuminated, each from the lamp lit before.[30]

If lineages of Śaiva preceptors and authors are, as Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha has it, like linked lines of lamps, we must admit that the rows which ignite the teachings of Aghoraśiva pass through many parts of India before reaching him in Tamilnadu.

30. *Mṛgendrāgamavṛtti*, Vidyāpāda, I.1 :

किमपि यदिह नोक्तं यच्च किञ्चिद्दुरुक्तम्
कथितमपि मया यत्प्रस्फुटं नावभाति ।
दिनकृत इव दोषापह्नवैकप्रवृत्ता–
स्तदपि विबुधमुख्यास्स्पष्टयन्तः क्षमन्ताम् ॥

FIVE DICTIONARIES IN THE TELUGU MANUSCRIPT COLLECTION OF THE BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE, PARIS

GERARD COLAS AND USHA COLAS-CHAUHAN

The study of the beginnings of European Indology is not in its infancy.[1] However a precise and all-encompassing study of the early European dictionaries of Indian languages is still wanting and many dictionaries remain in manuscript (ms.) form.

Among the Telugu mss. preserved at the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris[2], there are five mss. of bilingual and trilingual dictionaries of Telugu language: a Telugu-Sanskrit dictionary (["Diction. linguae telongou... etc."] manuscript n° **Indien 597**); two Telugu-French dictionaries ("Dictionnarie Telougou-François" **Indien 599** and "Dictionaire Telovgov-François" **Indien 600**); and two Telugu-Sanskrit-French dictionaries ("Dictionnaire Telongou-Samskrétan-François" **Indien 598** and Dictionnaire telingua et françois" **Indien 601**). Mention may be made of **Indien 225-226**, an incomplete French-Telugu dictionary and **Indien 138** which contains, besides several multi-lingual lexicons, a French-Portuguese-Tamil-Hindustani-Telugu medical lexicon in Roman script[3]. But the study of these last two mss. does not come within the scope of this article.[4]

1. For a general introduction to the beginnings of Indology, see W. Halbfass, *India and Europe : an essay in understanding*, New York, 1988, pp. 36-68.

2. See our forthcoming *A descriptive catalogue of the Telugu manuscripts of the Bibliothèque Nationale*, Paris. On the ms. collections of the Bibliothèque Nationale, see G. Colas, "South Asian documents in the Oriental Division of the Department of Manuscripts of the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris", in A. Gaur (ed.), *South Asian Studies*, British Library Occasional Papers 7, London, 1986, pp. 284-89.

3. Telugu translations are given upto fol. 25b of **Indien 225**. **Indien 138** is dated 1850 according to A. Cabaton: see *Catalogue sommaire des manuscripts indiens, indo-chinois et malaya-polynésiens*, Paris, 1912, p. 26, and V.M. Gnanapragasam, "Some Tamil manuscripts in the National Library of Paris", *Archivum Historicum Societatis Iesu*, vol. XL, 1971, Romae, p. 183.

4. Nor the study of the Bibliothèque Nationale mss. of Telugu lexicons written according to the traditional Indian standard. The *Āṃdhranighaṃṭuvu* of Gaṇapavarapu Vēṃkaṭakavi (**Indien 595**), the *Āṃdhranāmanighaṃṭuvu* of Kastūri Raṃgakavi (**Sanscrit 1808, ii**), two Telugu glosses on the *Amarakośa*, that of Veṃgaṃbhaṭṭa (**Sanscrit 617, i**) and another, anonymous and incomplete (**Sanscrit 1808, i**).